



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/619,352

07/14/2003

Mark L. Buer

2875.0140001

6343

26111 7590 05/20/2010
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

GEE, JASON KAI YIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2434

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/20/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/619,352	Applicant(s) BUER, MARK L.	
	Examiner JASON K. GEE	Art Unit 2434	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 30, 34-41 and 43-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 and 35-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41 and 43-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communication: amendment filed on 04/30/2010.
2. Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41, and 43-46 are currently pending in this application.
3. No new IDS has been received on this application.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the 103 art rejections have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
5. The Applicants are arguing that Simon as modified by Maufer do not teach that the sending of updated information is a response to when a sequence number reaches a predefined value. However, mentioned in the last Office Action, Simon as modified do teach these limitations. The applicants are arguing that Maufer's negotiation is a new security association, and is not used to update parameters of an existing security association. This is not so. As seen in Maufer paragraph 90, SA renegotiation may be predetermined, such as when a sequence number value gets within 33% or less, or could be another negotiated time. As seen in paragraphs 83 and 84, during negotiation, new values may be chosen (as seen in paragraphs 83 and 84, wherein security parameters index values can be selected; also, as seen in paragraph 91). This is also made clear in paragraph 7, which describes an SA/IKE negotiation as a negotiation in which parameters such as a key is chosen. It is also important to note the language.

This is Renegotiation, which suggests it is an update (not a simple negotiation).

Therefore, as seen in Maufer, after a sequence number reaches a predetermined value, SA parameters are renegotiated, resulting in a change of security parameters.

Even further, the applicants are construing the term “updating” too narrowly. Even if some of the parameters are new, new values can still ‘update’ the previous values. For example, if some parameters need to be changed or updated, a system can generate new numbers to make such a change. Even if these are still new numbers, these new numbers are still used to update the old previous ones. Again, as mentioned above, Maufer teaches renegotiation, and not a first negotiation of parameters. If the applicants wish to overcome these rejections, the applicants are suggested to narrow the claim limitations by adding specific claim limitations excluding the examples provided above. Further, applicants are advised to cancel the withdrawn claims.

.

6. The applicants are arguing the dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as discussed for the independent claim. The response above applies to the dependent claims as well, and therefore are not persuasive.

Claim Objections

7. The previous claim objections have been withdrawn in response to applicant’s amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The previous 112 rejections have been withdrawn in response to applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 18, 19, 21, 25-27, 38, 39, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Simon et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0093691 (hereinafter Simon), in view of Maufer et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0233576 (hereinafter Maufer).

As per claim 18, Simon teaches a method of providing redundancy in a security processing system comprising: establishing a first secure packet flow through a first (paragraph 70 and 95) security processor (paragraphs 50, 51, 59); updating a parameter in a set of parameters of security association associated with the first secure packet flow (paragraphs 59, 79, 80; as seen in paragraph 10 and 11, an SA may include multiple parameters); establishing a second secure packet flow through a second processor (paragraphs 70 and 95) security processor (50, 51, 59, Figure 1, as these processes take place on multiple edge routers); updating a parameter in a set of parameters of a security association associated with the second secure packet flow (paragraphs 50, 51, 59, and Figure 1, as these processes take place on multiple edge

Art Unit: 2434

routers); sending the updated parameter information associated with the first secure packet flow from the first security processor to the second security processor at a first predefined interval (paragraphs 60, 64, 66, 70, 74, and 82, wherein paragraphs 70 and 82 teaches that information may be distributed directly between edge routers, as it is advantageous to combine the functions of a cryptographic node with an edge router; also discussed in detail in paragraphs 72-73;); sending the updated parameter associated with the second secure packet flow for the second security processor to the first security processor at a second predefined interval (paragraphs 60, 65, 66, 70, 74, and 82, wherein paragraphs 70 and 82 teaches that information may be distributed directly between edge routers; also, Figure 1, wherein it shows multiple edge routers, and wherein the paragraphs teach that the edge routers send each other the updated SA information; also discussed in detail in paragraphs 72 and 73); storing the updated parameter associated with the first secure packet flow and the updated parameter associated with the second secure packet flow in the first security processor and in the second security processor (paragraphs 64-66 and 70).

However, at the time of the invention, Simon does not explicitly teach when updated parameters are sent when a sequence number in the security association information associated with secure packet flows reaches a predefined value. However, Maufer teaches this, such as in paragraph 88 and 90 (wherein SA parameters are renegotiated; also see paragraphs 83 and 84, and also 91, wherein these negotiations result in updated parameters; also see paragraph 7, wherein SA/IKE negotiation is an

agreement on chosen session keys). Also see paragraphs 23, and 24, wherein there exists parameters (plural, implying there are multiple parameters).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Simon and Maufer references to teach sending packets after a sequence number reaches a first predefined value. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to increase security and provide integration so that systems are compatible with IPSec's security algorithms. (paragraph 13 of Maufer).

The rejection for claim 18 above is herein incorporated with the rejection on its dependent claims.

As per claim 19, Simon teaches wherein the rerouting step is in response to a failure of packet flow through the first security processor (abstract, paragraph 79, paragraph 95).

As per claim 21, Maufer teaches wherein the sequence number in the set of security association parameters associated with the first secure packet flow is incremented when a packet in the first secure packet flow is received from or transmitted to a network (paragraph 88).

As per claim 25, Simon teaches generating at least one configuration packet including the updated parameter associated with the first secure packet flow,

wherein sending the updated parameter from the first security processor to the second security processor comprises sending the at least one configuration packet (paragraphs 54-55).

As per claim 26, Simon teaches sending, by a host processor, configuration information to the first security processor and the second security processor (paragraphs 32-37, 55, 56, 57).

As per claim 27, Simon teaches sending, by a host processor, security association configuration information to the first security processor and the second security processor (paragraphs 32-35, 37, 55, 56, 57).

Claim 38 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 18 above. (the system as taught throughout Simon and Maufer)

As per claim 39, Simon teaches at least one host processor connected to the at least one switch for terminating or initiating the first packet flow and the second packet flow (paragraph 43, Figure 3).

As per claim 45, Simon rerouting the secure packet flow to flow through the second security processor instead of the first (paragraphs 70, abstract, and paragraph 95)

As per claim 46, Simon teaches at least one host processor for establishing a first packet flow to a first security processor and a second packet flow to a second security processor (throughout the reference, and for example, paragraphs 70-73.

11. Claims 22, 29, 30, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon and Maufer as applied above, and in view of Xiong et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0061507 (hereinafter Xiong).

As per claim 22, Simon in view of Maufer does not explicitly teach wherein the updated parameter associated with the first secure packet flow comprises at least one bye count. However, Xiong teaches this in paragraph 23.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a sequence number with a security association. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition, as sequence numbers are commonly associated with security associations. This is taught in paragraph 23 of Xiong.. Also, by incorporating sequence numbers, the transmissions are more secure, as they prevent replay attacks (also found in paragraph 23).

As per claim 29, Simon teaches defining an interval to adjust the sequence number in the set of parameters of the security association associated with the first secure packet flow in paragraphs 79-80. Although Simon does not teach defining the quantity, this is taught by Xiong; Xiong teaches defining a quantity to adjust a sequence number in the set of parameters of the security association associated with a secure packet flow in paragraph 23. (this is also taught by Maufer in paragraph 88). Xiong also teaches determining whether to send the security association information according to a comparison of a sequence number with the interval in paragraph 23. Although it does not teach a second processor, Simon teaches incorporating sending

security associations to second security processors. Further, as taught by both Xiong and Maufer, the security association information is associated secure packet flows.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Simon as modified with Xiong to teach defining intervals to update parameters associated with security associations. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to create more security, as security association information is important, and utilizing sequence numbers in regards to SA information helps create more security. By incorporating sequence numbers, the transmissions are more secure, as they prevent replay attacks (also found in paragraph 23).

As per claim 30, Maufer teaches further comprising adding the quantity to the sequence number before sending the updated parameter associated with the first secure packet flow to the second security processor (paragraphs 88-90, wherein sequence numbers are incremented before they are sent out)

As per claim 34, Xiong teaches sending replay window information to the second security processor (paragraph 23, in combination with the Simon reference incorporating the second security processor).

12. Claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon and Maufer as applied above, and in view of Rosenow et al. US Patent No. 5,022,076 (hereinafter Rosenow).

As per claim 40, Simon teaches changing the routing of packet flow by either routing the first packet flow to the second security processor instead of the first security processor or routing the second packet flow to the first security processor instead of the second security processor (paragraphs 72, 73, 75, 76, and 77). However, Simon as modified by Maufer does not explicitly teach wherein the one host processor changes the routing of the packet flow. However, routing processes from one processor to another processor is well known in the art, as taught by Rosenow. Rosenow teaches throughout the reference the routing of processes from one processor to another processor, such as in the abstract and in col. 23 lines 59 to col. 24 line 11.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Rosenow reference with the Simon and Maufer combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to provide more reliability by creating a fault tolerant system. This is taught throughout Rosenow, such as in the abstract and col. 4 lines 15-61.

As per claim 41, Rosenow teaches wherein the change in the routing is in response to a failure of the first packet flow through the first security processor or the second flow through the second security processor (abstract; col. 23 line 59 to col. 24 line 11). Also, this is taught in Simon's abstract, paragraph 79, and paragraph 95.

Claim 43 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 40 above.

Claim 44 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 40 above. (it routes to whatever processor is working).

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON K. GEE whose telephone number is (571)272-6431. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-38113811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2434

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jason Gee/
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2400
05/18/2010

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434